



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,125	12/22/2003	Peter M. Bonutti	2500DV2CN2DV3CN6	7494
50855	7590	10/29/2007	EXAMINER	
COVIDIEN			KASZTEJNA, MATTHEW JOHN	
60 MIDDLETOWN AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NORTH HAVEN, CT 06473			3739	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/29/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/743,125	BONUTTI, PETER M.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew J. Kasztejna	3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 11-15 and 22-27 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 11-15 and 22-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 23, 2007 has been entered.

Notice of Amendment

In response to the amendment filed on August 23, 2007, amended claims 11, 13-14; canceled claims 20-21; and new claims 22-27 are acknowledged. The following new and reiterated grounds of rejection are set forth:

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 11-15 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 11 of copending Application No. 10/729,634. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 11 of the instant application is broader than claims 1 and 9 of copending Application No. 10/729,634. Claims 1 and 11 of copending application No. 10/729,634 recite a retractor comprised of a shaft, inflatable bladder disposed at an end of the shaft where the bladder has an inflatable shape selected from the group consisting of circular, oval, eccentric, oblong, conical, wedge-shaped, V-shaped and multiple lobes, along with other features. Claim 11 of the instant application recites a retractor comprised of a shaft and an inflatable bladder that is eccentric or eccentrically mounted on the shaft. Furthermore, claims 13-15 of the instant invention are identical to claims 4-6 of copending Application No. 10/729,634, respectively.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 11-15 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 7 of copending Application No. 10/743,192. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 11 of the instant application is broader than claims 1 and 7 of copending Application No. 10/743,192.

The combination of claims 1 and 7 disclose a similar retractor of the instant invention differing only in the shape of the inflatable bladder. Furthermore, claims 13-15 of the instant invention are identical to claims 2-4 of copending Application No. 10/743,192, respectively.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 11-15 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 15-21 of copending Application No. 10/729,768 (Note: Claims 15-21 refer to the most recent claim amendment on file in Application No. 10/729,768 - filed July 1, 2005). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 11 of the instant application is broader than claim 1 and 21 of copending Application No. 10/729,768. Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/729,768 recites an apparatus comprised of a shaft and an inflatable bladder wherein the inflatable bladder has a shape selected from the group consisting of: eccentric, conical and wedge-shaped, along with other features. Claims 13-15 are identical to claims 16-18 of copending Application No. 10/729,768, respectively.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: the sentence is missing a period. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 22, 24 and 26-27 are objected to because of the following informalities:

The claims all contain the phrase "the plurality of inflatable bladders is". The phrase should read, "the plurality of inflatable bladders are". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-15 and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,148,307 to Utsugi in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,295,464 to Shihata.

In regard to claims 11, 14-15 and 25, Utsugi discloses a retractor comprising: a shaft 11 including at least one flexible portion; a plurality of inflatable bladders 12, 13, 14 disposed on the shaft, at least one of the inflatable bladders being disposed about the at least one flexible portion of the shaft and being configured to cause at least a section of the at least one flexible portion of the shaft to become more rigid when the at least one inflatable bladder is inflated (see Figs. 1-4 and Col. 2, Lines 29-35). Utsugi is silent with respect to a cannula having a passage which receives the shaft to deploy the bladder at a target site in tissue. Shihata teaches of an analogous apparatus having a cannula 102 which has a passage that receives a catheter 101 therethrough. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use a

cannula with the apparatus of Utsugi to aid in placing the shaft at a desired site within the body as taught by Shihata.

In regard to claims 12-13, Utsugi discloses a retractor, wherein the at least one inflatable bladder is shaped so that it expands into an eccentric shape when inflated by fluid pressure introduced through the shaft (see Figs. 4a-c).

In regard to claims 22 and 26, Utsugi discloses a retractor, wherein the plurality of inflatable bladders are eccentrically mounted on the shaft (see Figs. 4a-c, 6 and Col. 5, Lines 5-23).

In regard to claim 23, Utsugi discloses a retractor, wherein the plurality of inflatable bladders includes at least two inflatable bladders that abut each other (see Fig.3).

In regard to claims 24 and 27, Utsugi discloses a retractor, wherein the plurality of inflatable bladders are axially spaced along the shaft (see Fig. 1).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-15 and 22-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Kasztejna whose telephone number is (571) 272-6086. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda C.M. Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone

Art Unit: 3739

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJK *[Signature]*

10/19/07



LINDA C. M. DVORAK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 3700